

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/699,608	10/30/2000	Srinivas Gutta	US000257	6759
24737	7590 10/30/2003		EXAM	INER
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			NGUYEN, CAO H	
P.O. BOX 30 BRIARCLIF	001 FMANOR, NY 10510		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	,	•	2173	
			DATE MAILED: 10/30/2003	, 4
				1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



4

# Office Action Summary

Application No. **09/699,608** 

Applicant(s)

Art Unit

Gutta et al.

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen 2173

	Ш

	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
	for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.							
- Extens	- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the						
mailing	) date of this communication. Deriod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within t						
- If NO p	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply or to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the	and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.					
- Any re	ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of t						
Status	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1) 💢	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 15, 2	2003					
2a) 🗌	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) 🔀 This act	tion is non-final. Wh					
3) 🗆	_						
Disposit	tion of Claims						
4) 💢	Claim(s) 1-23	is/are pending in the application.					
· 4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) 🗆	Claim(s)	is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u>						
7) 🗌	Claim(s)	is/are objected to.					
8) 🗆	Claims	are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applica	tion Papers						
9) 🗌	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are	a) $\square$ accepted or b) $\square$ objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the d	Irawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	to this Office action.					
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exami	iner.					
	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120						
13)∐	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign p	riority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) L	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:						
•	1. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	re been received.					
•	2. $\square$ Certified copies of the priority documents hav	re been received in Application No					
	application from the International Bure						
*Se	ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of th	e certified copies not received.					
14) 📙	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic						
Ċ	a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.						
15)∟	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic	priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.					
Attachme							
	tice of References Cited (PTO-892) tice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s).					
	promotion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 6) Other:					
	The state of the s	o, oute.					

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103© and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sciammarella et al. (US Patent No. 6,608,633 B1) in view of Alexander et al. (US Patent No. 6,177,931 B1).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Sciammarella discloses A method for displaying available television programs, comprising the steps of: obtaining a recommendation score for each of said

available programs (see Abstract and col. 3, lines 1-18); and displaying said list of available programs to a user with an indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score; obtaining a list of available programs (see col. 5, lines 5-67). However, Sciammarella fails to explicitly teach obtaining a list of available programs.

Alexander teaches obtaining a list of available programs (see col. 7, lines 1-65 and figure 3). It would have been obvious to one of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide obtaining a list of available programs as taught by Alexander to the visual display categorical information of Sciammarella; in order-enhancing a user friendly and enable to provide maximum visual information about categorical information being displayed on a display screen.

Regarding claim 2, Sciammarella-discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score provides a component score of said one or more program attributes. (see col. 6, lines 43-65).

Regarding claim 3, Sciammarella discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score indicates a most significant program attribute (see col. 9, lines 13-20).

Regarding claim 4, Sciammarella discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score indicates a predefined number of most significant program attributes (see col. 6, lines 43-65).

Regarding claim 5, Sciammarella discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score utilizes a color scheme (see col. 4, lines 1-65).

Regarding claims 6 and 7, Sciammarella discloses wherein said color scheme discretely maps said score to a color; and wherein said color scheme continuously maps said score to a color (see col. 3, lines 43-67).

Regarding claims 8 and 9, Alexander discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation-score utilizes a variable size-of-text scheme; and wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score utilizes a variable rate-of-flicker scheme (see col. 29, lines 14-67).

Regarding claims 10 and 11, Alexander discloses wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score utilizes a variable brightness scheme; wherein said indication of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score utilizes a variable bar height (see col. 29-30, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 13 and 14, Sciammarella discloses wherein said visual cue of one or more program attributes contributing to said recommendation score utilizes a color scheme; and wherein said color scheme discretely maps said score to a color (see col. 10, lines 1-55).

As claims 15-23 are analyzed as previously discussed with respect to claims 1-13 above.

#### Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's 3. OMMA disclosure. (See PTO-892).

Response

Responses to this action should be mailed to Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, 4. Washington, D.C. 20231. If applicant-desires to fax a response, (703) 308-9051 may be used for formal communications or (703) 305-9724 for informal or draft communications.

Please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT" for informal facsimile communications. For after final responses, please label "AFTER FINAL" or "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE" on the document.

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

### Inquires

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner 5. should be directed to Cao (Kevin) Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 305-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached on (703) 308-3116. The fax number for this group is (703) 746-7240.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3800.

Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Primary Examiner (AU 21

October 28, 2003